UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS SHERMAN DIVISION RAYTHEON COMPANY 1 CASE NO. 4:07CV109 VS.] 10 AM, NOVEMBER 18, 2008 INDIGO SYSTEMS CORP., ET AL] PLANO, TEXAS REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF TELECONFERENCE RE PRETRIAL SCHEDULING VOLUME 1 OF 1, PAGES 1 THROUGH 39 THE HONORABLE RICHARD SCHELL, U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, PRESIDING PROCEEDINGS REPORTED USING COMPUTERIZED STENOTYPE, TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED USING COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION.

2 [COURT REPORTER'S NOTES 20081118, 10 AM, TUESDAY, 1 NOVEMBER 18, 2008, PLANO, TEXAS, U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE RICHARD 2 3 SCHELL PRESIDING] **APPEARANCES:** FOR THE PLAINTIFF RAYTHEON: KEITH ALAN RUTHERFORD (BY PHONE) 5 ATTORNEY AT LAW 6 WONG CABELLO LUTSCH RUTHERFORD & 7 BRUCCULERI 8 20333 SH 249, SUITE 600 9 HOUSTON, TEXAS 77070 10 832-446-2400 11 AND 12 JOE KENDALL (BY PHONE) 13 ATTORNEY AT LAW 14 PROVOST UMPHREY 15 ATTORNEY AT LAW 16 17 3232 MCKINNEY AVENUE, SUITE 700 DALLAS, TEXAS 75204 18 214-744-3000 19 **AND** 20 21 M. ROSS CUNNINGHAM (BY PHONE) ATTORNEY AT LAW 22 23 **ROSE WALKER** 24 3500 MAPLE AVENUE, SUITE 900 DALLAS, TEXAS 75219 25

	3
1	214-752-8600
2	FOR THE DEFENDANTS INDIGO AND FLIR:
3	CLYDE SIEBMAN (BY PHONE)
	ATTORNEY AT LAW
4	
5	SIEBMAN, REYNOLDS, BURG, PHILLIPS &
6	SMITH
7	300 NORTH TRAVIS
8	SHERMAN, TEXAS 75090
9	903-870-0070
10	AND
11	MICHAEL J. COLLINS (BY PHONE)
12	ATTORNEY AT LAW
13	BICKEL & BREWER
14	1717 MAIN STREET, SUITE 4800
15	DALLAS, TEXAS 75201
16	214-653-4000
17	AND
18	ROBERT L. GARNER (BY PHONE)
19	ATTORNEY AT LAW
20	BICKEL & BREWER
21	767 FIFTH AVENUE, 50TH FLOOR
22	NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10153
23	212-489-1400
24	AND
25	

	4
1	ROBERT STEINBERG (BY PHONE)
2	ATTORNEY AT LAW
3	LATHAM & WATKINS
4	355 SOUTH GRAND AVENUE
5	LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90071
6	213-485-1234
7	
8	THE COURT: CAN YOU HEAR ME?
9	MR. SIEBMAN: YES, JUDGE, WE CAN.
10	THE COURT: OKAY. GOOD.
11	LET ME CALL THE CASE AND THEN CHECK OFF WHO IS ON
12	THE LINE. THIS CASE IS STYLED "RAYTHEON COMPANY VERSUS INDIGO
13	SYSTEMS CORPORATION AND FLIR SYSTEMS, INC.," CASE NUMBER
14	4:07CV109.
15	AND I SHOULD HAVE ON THE LINE FOR RAYTHEON ROSS
16	CUNNINGHAM. ARE YOU THERE, MR. CUNNINGHAM?
17	MR. CUNNINGHAM: YES, SIR.
18	THE COURT: AND YOU ARE GOING TO BE SPEAKING FOR
19	RAYTHEON, IS THAT CORRECT?
20	MR. CUNNINGHAM: NO, SIR, JOE KENDALL WILL BE
21	SPEAKING ON BEHALF OF RAYTHEON.
22	THE COURT: OKAY. ALL RIGHT.
23	MR. KENDALL, YOU ARE THERE?
24	MR. KENDALL: YES, YOUR HONOR.
25	THE COURT: OKAY. AND KEITH RUTHERFORD. IS KEITH
	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

5 RUTHERFORD THERE? NO. OKAY. 10:06AM 1 ALL RIGHT. FOR THE DEFENDANTS FLIR AND INDIGO, IS 10:06AM 2 CLYDE SIEBMAN ON THE LINE? 3 10:06AM MR. SIEBMAN: YES, YOUR HONOR. 10:06AM 4 THE COURT: OKAY. AND IS MR. GARNER ON THE LINE? 10:06AM 5 MR. GARNER: YES, YOUR HONOR. 10:06AM 6 THE COURT: OKAY. 10:06AM 7 **VOICE: HELLO?** 10:06AM **8** THE COURT: AND IS BOB STEINBERG ON THE LINE? 10:06AM **9** 10:06AM **10** MR. STEINBERG: YES, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: OKAY. AND IS MICHAEL COLLINS ON THE 10:06AM **11** 10:06AM **12** | LINE? MR. COLLINS: YES, I AM, YOUR HONOR. 10:06AM **13** THE COURT: OKAY. DID SOMEONE ELSE JUST JOIN US? 10:06AM **14** MR. RUTHERFORD: JUDGE SCHELL, THIS IS KEITH 10:06AM **15** 10:06AM 16 RUTHERFORD. SORRY, MY PHONE CUT OUT THERE FOR A SECOND. 10:06AM **17** THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. I THINK THAT'S EVERYONE THEN. 10:06AM **18** OKAY. LET'S SEE, MR. SIEBMAN, ARE YOU GOING TO BE 10:07AM **19** SPEAKING FOR THE DEFENDANTS? 10:07AM **20** MR. SIEBMAN: YES, YOUR HONOR. 10:07AM **21** THE COURT: OKAY. 10:07AM **22** I RECEIVED THE LETTER FROM MR. SIEBMAN DATED 10:07AM **23** NOVEMBER 17TH, 2008, CONTAINING THE REQUEST BY THE DEFENDANTS 10:07AM **24** TO VACATE THE PRETRIAL SUBMISSION DEADLINES IN THE--I GUESS THE 10:07AM **25**

MOST-RECENT ORDER TO EXTEND DOCKET-CONTROL DEADLINES WHICH I 10:07AM 1 SIGNED NOVEMBER 4TH OF 2008, AND THE DEFENDANTS' REQUEST TO 10:07AM 2 EXTEND THE DEADLINE FOR RESPONDING TO PENDING MOTIONS FOR ONE 10:07AM WEEK AND TO RESTYLE THE FINAL PRETRIAL CONFERENCE COMING UP 10:08AM **4** THIS THURSDAY AS A STATUS AND RESCHEDULING CONFERENCE. 10:08AM **5** I ALSO RECEIVED THE LETTER FROM MR. CUNNINGHAM DATED 10:08AM 6 7 NOVEMBER 17TH RESPONDING TO MR. SIEBMAN'S LETTER AND STATING 10:08AM THE PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO POSTPONING ANY OF THE AGREED 10:08AM **8** DEADLINES IN THE NOVEMBER 4TH DOCKET-CONTROL ORDER. 10:08AM **9** SO I GUESS THE QUESTION IS: WHAT WOULD YOU-ALL LIKE 10:08AM **10** TO DO? I KNOW YOU ARE WAITING FOR ME ON A NUMBER OF MOTIONS. 10:08AM **11** I THINK JUST IN THE MONTH OF NOVEMBER I'VE RECEIVED 13 MORE 10:08AM **12** MOTIONS. THOSE ARE NOT RIPE. BUT THE ONES THAT ARE RIPE 10:09AM **13** INCLUDE THE DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, ALSO THE 10:09AM **14** DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SANCTIONS, FOR SPOLIATION OF EVIDENCE. 10:09AM **15** THEN RAYTHEON HAS A MOTION TO DETERMINE WAIVER OF 10:09AM **16** 10:09AM **17** PRIVILEGE. IS THAT MOTION STILL URGED, MR. KENDALL? MR. KENDALL: YOUR HONOR, I'LL HAVE TO DEFER TO 10:09AM **18** MR. CUNNINGHAM ON THAT. 10:09AM **19** THE COURT: OKAY. 10:09AM **20** 10:09AM **21** MR. CUNNINGHAM: YES, YOUR HONOR, IT IS. THE COURT: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. THEN RAYTHEON HAS 10:09AM **22** ALSO FILED A MOTION FOR LEAVE TO SUPPLEMENT PATENT-INFRINGEMENT 10:09AM **23** 10:09AM **24** CONTENTIONS, AND I KNOW YOU NEED A RULING ON THAT. THEN THE DEFENDANTS HAVE FILED A MOTION TO COMPEL 10:09AM **25**

7 DISCOVERY REGARDING MISAPPROPRIATION AND DAMAGES, AND A MOTION 10:10AM 1 TO COMPEL. 10:10AM 2 AND ALSO RAYTHEON HAS FILED A MOTION TO STRIKE THE 10:10AM **3** DEFENDANTS' ANSWER TO AN AMENDED COMPLAINT, IT LOOKS LIKE. 10:10AM **4** ANYWAY--AND I HAVEN'T GIVEN YOU MY CLAIM CONSTRUCTION 10:10AM **5** 6 AND IT'S ALL BECAUSE I HAVEN'T HAD TIME. 10:10AM 10:10AM **7** WHAT--I'M NOT SURE, BUT I GUESS I NEED TO LET YOU SPEAK FIRST AS TO WHETHER YOU CAN GO FORWARD ON THIS CASE IN 10:10AM **8** JANUARY WITHOUT ME RULING PRETTY QUICKLY ON A NUMBER OF THESE 10:10AM **9** MOTIONS THAT I HAVE JUST GONE OVER AS WELL AS GIVING YOU MY 10:10AM **10** CLAIM CONSTRUCTION. 10:11AM **11** MR. SIEBMAN: YOUR HONOR. CLYDE SIEBMAN. I CAN 10:11AM **12** 10:11AM 13 | SPEAK TO THAT IF THE COURT WOULD LIKE. THE COURT: OKAY. 10:11AM **14** MR. SIEBMAN: THAT WAS REALLY THE BASIS FOR OUR 10:11AM **15** LETTER IS THAT IT'S OBVIOUS TO US THAT--THAT THE CASE CAN'T BE 10:11AM **16** 10:11AM **17** READY REALISTICALLY BY JANUARY. NOT ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF THE PENDING ISSUES, BUT UNDER THE NEW--EVEN UNDER THIS NEW SCHEDULE 10:11AM **18** IF YOU--IF EVERYONE TAKES THE MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF TIME THAT THEY 10:11AM **19** WOULD HAVE UNDER THE LOCAL AND FEDERAL RULES TO FILE THE 10:11AM **20** VARIOUS MOTIONS, RESPONSES AND REPLIES, THE COURT'S GONNA BE 10:11AM **21** FACED WITH AN ADDITIONAL NUMBER OF DAUBERT MOTIONS AND MOTIONS 10:11AM **22** FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON THE DAMAGES ISSUES IMMEDIATELY BEFORE 10:11AM **23** TRIAL OR ON THE--ON THE DAY OF TRIAL, POSSIBLY EVEN--10:11AM **24** EVEN AFTER JANUARY 20TH, THE DEADLINE WOULD EXPIRE. AND SOME 10:11AM **25**

10:12AM

10:12AM

10:12AM **3**

10:12AM **4**

10:12AM **5**

10:12AM **7**

10:12AM **8**

10:12AM **9**

10:12AM **10**

10:12AM **11**

10:12AM **12**

10:12AM **13**

10:12AM **14**

10:13AM **15**

10:13AM **16**

10:13AM **17**

10:13AM **18**

10:13AM **19**

10:13AM **20**

10:13AM **21**

10:13AM **22**

10:13AM **23**

10:13AM **24**

10:13AM **25**

10:12AM

1

2

6

8

OF THOSE ARE GONNA BE VERY NEEDY--AT LEAST THE ONES THAT WE'RE GONNA FILE ON THE DAMAGES, WE THINK THAT THE DAMAGES ARE VERY QUESTIONABLE AND THAT THE DAMAGE THEORIES ARE WEAK, AND WE'RE GONNA HAVE SOME VERY SUBSTANTIVE MOTIONS ON THE DAMAGES. AND UNDER THIS CURRENT SCHEDULE I DON'T SEE ANY WAY THAT THE COURT CAN--THAT WE CAN EXPECT THE COURT FAIRLY TO--WHAT I'M SUGGEST-ING IS IT'S NOT FAIR TO THE COURT FOR US TO EXPECT THAT THE COURT CAN RULE ON THE VOLUME OF MOTIONS THAT HAVE BEEN FILED AND THAT ARE GONNA BE FILED AND STILL MAINTAIN A REALISTIC EXPECTATION THAT WE'RE GONNA MAINTAIN A JANUARY 20TH TRIAL DATE. WE REALLY THOUGHT THAT THOSE ISSUES COULD BE DISCUSSED ON THURSDAY. THE REASON THAT WE FILED THIS LETTER AND BROUGHT THIS TO THE COURT'S ATTENTION IN ADVANCE OF THURSDAY IS THAT IN WORKING THROUGH THE WORK THAT WE HAVE ON OUR PLATE IT'S GONNA BE VIRTUALLY IMPOSSIBLE OR VERY, VERY DIFFICULT TO THOROUGHLY COMPLETE THE WORK THAT WE HAVE TO DO UNDER THE CURRENT SCHEDULE EVEN FOR THURSDAY WITH RESPECT TO THE JOINT FINAL PRETRIAL ORDER, RESPONSES ON THE VARIOUS MOTIONS THAT ARE PENDING. AND RATHER THAN CONTINUE WHAT WE CONSIDER TO BE SOMEWHAT OF A CHARADE IN TERMS OF--OF ATTEMPTING WHAT'S IMPOSSIBLE, WE THOUGHT IT MADE MORE SENSE TO COME TO THE COURT AND SAY, "YOU KNOW, LET'S--LET'S RELIEVE OURSELVES, BOTH SIDES, OF THE RESPONSIBILITY TO DO THIS FINAL JOINT PRETRIAL ORDER WHEN IN FACT IT'S GONNA NOT BE ANYTHING LIKE A JOINT FINAL PRETRIAL ORDER NO MATTER WHAT WE DO." FOR EXAMPLE, PENDING CURRENTLY

9 THERE ARE--EVEN THE EXPERT DEPOSITIONS HAVE NOT BEEN TAKEN. 10:13AM 1 THE DEFENDANTS' EXPERT WALTER BRADDOCK HAS HAD A NUMBER OF 10:13AM 2 ISSUES WITH RESPECT TO HEALTH, DEATHS IN THE FAMILY OR 10:14AM **3** ILLNESSES IN THE FAMILY--I DON'T REMEMBER IF IT WAS ILLNESSES 10:14AM **4** OR DEATHS IN THE FAMILY, HE'S HAD OTHER COMMITMENTS, AND WE'RE 10:14AM **5** NOT EVEN GONNA BE ABLE TO TAKE THEIR EXPERT UNTIL AFTER THE 10:14AM 6 10:14AM **7** JOINT FINAL PRETRIAL ORDER. THERE HAVE JUST BEEN ALL SORTS OF 10:14AM **8** DELAYS THAT HAVE PUSHED THINGS BEYOND THAT DATE AND IT'S JUST NOT PRACTICAL TO--TO--TO PRESENT A GENUINE FINAL JOINT PRETRIAL 10:14AM **9** ORDER WITH ALL THAT'S OUTSTANDING AND ALL THAT'S ON OUR PLATE 10:14AM **10** AND ALL THAT'S YET TO BE DONE. AND SO WE THOUGHT IT MADE MORE 10:14AM **11** SENSE. INSTEAD OF WASTING THE RESOURCES OF THE PARTIES TO--TO 10:14AM **12** COME TO GRIPS WITH THIS POINT, WITH THIS FACT, AND NOT DO THE 10:14AM **13** FINAL JOINT PRETRIAL ORDER, USE THURSDAY AS A SCHEDULING 10:14AM **14** OPPORTUNITY, AND FIGURE OUT WHEN REALISTICALLY WE CAN GET THIS 10:15AM **15** CASE ON TRACK, WHEN IT CAN REALISTICALLY BE TRIED, YOU KNOW, 10:15AM **16** 10:15AM **17** GIVING THE COURT THE TIME THAT IT FAIRLY NEEDS TO RESOLVE THESE 10:15AM **18** ISSUES. THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU, MR. SIEBMAN. 10:15AM **19** MR. KENDALL? 10:15AM **20** MR. KENDALL: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. I'M GLAD AT 10:15AM **21** 10:15AM **22**

LEAST THE REAL DEAL HAS BEEN ARTICULATED HERE. WHAT'S GOING
ON IS BICKEL & BREWER--BILL BREWER ENTERED THIS CASE THIS LAST
SUMMER, AND WHAT IT'S REALLY ALL ABOUT IS TRYING TO PUSH THIS
TRIAL DATE OFF BECAUSE, AS I UNDERSTAND IT, MR. BREWER IS GONNA

10:15AM **23**

10:15AM **24**

10:15AM **25**

10:15AM **1**

10:15AM **2**

10:15AM **3**

10:15AM **4**

10:15AM **5**

10:15AM **6**

10:15AM **7**

10:16AM **8**

10:16AM **9**

10:16AM **10**

10:16AM **11**

10:16AM **12**

10:16AM **13**

10:16AM **14**

10:16AM **15**

10:16AM **16**

10:16AM **17**

10:16AM **18**

10:16AM **19**

10:16AM **20**

10:16AM **21**

10:16AM **22**

10:17AM **23**

10:17AM **24**

10:17AM **25**

BE THE PRIMARY PERSON COMING IN AT THE ELEVENTH HOUR WHO IS
ACTUALLY GONNA TRY THIS LAWSUIT. THAT'S WELL AND GOOD. THE
DEFENDANTS CAN HAVE WHOEVER THEY WANT IN THE ROOM DOING IT,

BUT WE SHOULD NOT BE PUNISHED FOR THAT DECISION.

WITH REGARD TO--LET ME JUST MAKE THIS POINT. WHAT WE'RE DEALING WITH NOW, THE ORDER YOU SIGNED, THE LIVE ORDER OF NOVEMBER 4, WAS AGREED, READING THAT WORD IN THE KEY OF G. NOTHING THAT'S BEEN TALKED ABOUT HERE WAS UNKNOWN TO EVERYONE INVOLVED, YOU KNOW, JUST A COUPLE OF WEEKS AGO WHEN THE MATTERS WERE NEGOTIATED AND SUBMITTED TO THE COURT FOR APPROVAL, WHICH THE COURT DID.

WITH REGARD TO WHAT'S ACTUALLY IN THE LETTER THAT
YOU HAVE BEFORE YOU, THESE MATTERS THAT ARE IN DISPUTE, BE
THEY THE DAUBERT MOTIONS, BE THEY THE MOTIONS IN LIMINE, BE
THEY EVEN THE DAMAGE EXPERT AS WELL AS THE MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT, ALL THESE MATTERS CAN BE RESOLVED AT OR NEAR THE TIME
OF TRIAL. WE ARE PERFECTLY CONTENT TO GO FORWARD.

NOW, WITH REGARD TO THOSE DATES, WE HAVE NO PROBLEM PUSHING--EVEN DOING AWAY WITH THURSDAY'S GET-TOGETHER AND PUSHING THE PRETRIAL ORDER MAYBE UNTIL EVEN EARLY JANUARY, IF NEED BE. THE DEAL WE HAVE TO DIE ON IS THAT JANUARY 20TH TRIAL SETTING. AND I WOULD ARGUE TO YOU--WELL, LET'S, TAKE FOR INSTANCE, CLAIMS CONSTRUCTION, MARKMAN. LET'S NOT FORGET WHAT THAT IS. THAT WAS SOMETHING UNTIL MARKMAN THAT WAS A JURY ISSUE. AND COURTS CAN GIVE US A MARKMAN RULING AT THE TIME OF

10:17AM **1**

10:17AM **2**

10:17AM **3**

10:17AM **4**

10:17AM **5**

10:17AM **6**

10:17AM **7**

10:17AM **8**

10:17AM **9**

10:17AM **10**

10:17AM **11**

10:18AM **12**

10:18AM **13**

10:18AM **14**

10:18AM **15**

10:18AM **16**

10:18AM **17**

10:18AM **18**

10:18AM **19**

10:18AM **20**

10:18AM **21**

10:18AM **22**

10:18AM **23**

10:18AM **24**

10:18AM **25**

TRIAL, IF NEED BE. AND SO WHAT I WOULD SUGGEST TO YOU IS THAT EVERYTHING THAT IS BEING TALKED ABOUT IN THE LETTER AND HERE ON THIS TELEPHONE CALL ARE MATTERS THAT CAN BE RESOLVED AS WE PUSH TOWARD TRIAL ON JANUARY 20.

AND THIS CASE HAS BEEN--I WOULD SUGGEST TO YOU--IF
PAST EXPERIENCE IS ANY INDICATOR OF WHAT'S LIKELY TO HAPPEN IN
THE FUTURE, I WOULD SUGGEST FOR JUDICIAL ECONOMY'S SAKE THAT
MAYBE WE'RE GETTING CLOSE TO THE TIME WHERE THE MOTION PRACTICE
MUST END AND THE TRIAL BEGIN. AND WE DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM-AS LONG AS WE KEEP OUR JANUARY 20 TRIAL DATE--REACHING ANY
COMPROMISE THE COURT BELIEVES IS FAIR BOTH FOR THE DEFENDANTS'
CONCERNS AS WELL AS THE COURT'S SCHEDULE AND THE COURT'S TIME.

ONE THING ELSE THAT I WOULD REQUEST AND MAYBE SUGGEST TO THE COURT, THAT--WELL, HERE'S WHAT I WOULD SUGGEST AS A COMPROMISE: KEEP THE DATES WE AGREED ON TWO WEEKS AGO. NOTHING NEW HAS HAPPENED SINCE THEN.

AND WITH REGARD TO RULINGS, I'M QUITE SURE, LIKE
MOST JUDGES, YOU ARE GONNA RULE WHEN YOU HAVE TIME TO RULE.
BUT I WOULD SUGGEST TO YOU WITH WHAT YOU'VE GOT OUT THERE,
FRANKLY, ON THE MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON DAMAGES IT MAY
BE QUICKER FOR JUDICIAL ECONOMY JUST TO TRY THE THING AND RULE
ON THESE MATTERS AT THE TIME OF THE TRIAL AS WE GO--GO THROUGH
IT. THAT MIGHT BE QUICKER THAN TAKING THE TIME NECESSARY TO
MAKE THESE RULINGS AND THEN GO FORWARD. A LOT OF COURTS WILL
DELAY RULING ON A MARKMAN OR MAKE A QUICK MARKMAN BOTH UNDER

10:19AM 1

10:19AM 2

10:19AM **3**

10:19AM **4**

10:19AM **5**

10:19AM **6**

10:19AM **7**

10:19AM **8**

10:19AM **10**

10:19AM **11**

10:19AM **12**

10:19AM **13**

10:19AM **14**

10:19AM **16**

10:20AM **17**

10:20AM **18**

10:20AM **19**

10:20AM **20**

10:20AM **21**

10:20AM **22**

10:20AM **23**

10:20AM **24**

10:20AM **25**

THEORIES OF WANTING TO FOSTER SETTLEMENT. SOME -- SOME COURTS TAKE THE POSITION, "WELL, YOU KNOW, IF I RULE ON IT QUICKLY, THAT HELPS FACILITATE SETTLEMENT BECAUSE IT GIVES CLEAR GUIDANCE" AND/OR WAIT TILL THE LAST MINUTE TO CREATE ENOUGH UNCERTAINTY THAT THERE'S MORE LIKELIHOOD--BUT MAKE NO MISTAKE ABOUT IT, A MARKMAN RULING IS FOR THE JURY'S BENEFIT. THAT CAN BE MADE DURING THE COURSE OF THE TRIAL. IN FACT, I MEAN I--

THE COURT: YEAH. BUT DOESN'T IT ALSO HELP YOU 10:19AM 9 PREPARE FOR TRIAL? I MEAN TAILOR YOUR EVIDENCE FOR TRIAL?

> MR. KENDALL: IT CAN. IT CAN. AND ALL I'M SAYING TO YOU IS WE'RE CONTENT TO GO FORWARD IN WHATEVER TIME YOU WANT TO ALLOT US TO TRY THIS CASE. OUR CLIENTS WANT RESOLUTION AND WE WANT TO MOVE FORWARD.

BUT WHAT I WAS GONNA SUGGEST TO YOU IS THE 10:19AM 15 PLAINTIFFS WOULD REQUEST THE COURT--WE WOULD LIKE TO GO BACK TO JUDGE FAULKNER IN EARLY JANUARY. AND NOT THAT I COULD TELL YOU AS AN OFFICER OF THE COURT WITH ANY HIGH DEGREE OF CONFIDENCE THAT THAT EXERCISE MIGHT PROVE FRUITFUL, BUT AT LEAST BY THAT TIME EVERYONE WILL HAVE A REAL CLEAR PICTURE OF WHAT WE'RE DEALING WITH AND PERHAPS SAVE THE COURT SOME TIME THERE.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT.

MR. KENDALL: WITH REGARD TO ALL THE THINGS COMPLAINED OF IN THE LETTER. THE ONLY STRONG. HARD POSITION WE TAKE IS, JUDGE, WE DON'T WANT TO LOSE OUR TRIAL SETTING AND WE THINK THAT IS WHAT WILL BRING THIS CASE TO A HEAD. AND REALLY.

13 WHEN YOU GO THROUGH IT, MOTIONS IN LIMINE, THEY CAN BE RULED 10:20AM 1 ON THE DAY OF, THE DAUBERT MOTIONS AS WELL. YOU KNOW, THE 10:20AM 2 LIKELIHOOD OF ONE OF THOSE BEING GRANTED, I MEAN THOSE AREN'T 10:20AM GRANTED VERY OFTEN IN CASES OF THIS MAGNITUDE WITH THE KIND 10:20AM **4** OF LAWYERING YOU'VE GOT GOING ON HERE. 10:20AM **5** THE SAME THING--I'VE ALREADY MADE MY ARGUMENT ABOUT 10:20AM 6 10:20AM **7** THE CLAIM CONSTRUCTION. AND AS I SAID, THE MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY 10:21AM **8** JUDGMENT ON THE DAMAGE ISSUES, I MEAN THAT'S, ONCE AGAIN, YOU KNOW, X DOLLARS, Y DOLLARS. 10:21AM **9** AND AGAIN I WANT TO STRESS THESE ARE AGREED UPON. 10:21AM **10** AND WHAT'S REALLY GOING ON HERE IS A SEEKING OF DELAY OF THE 10:21AM **11** TRIAL SETTING. AND THAT IS SOMETHING THAT WE REALLY STRONGLY 10:21AM **12** HOPE THAT THE COURT WILL NOT ENGAGE IN, AND PUSH US TO TRIAL. 10:21AM **13** PLAINTIFFS ARE READY TO GO FORWARD. WE ARE READY TO TRY THE 10:21AM **14** LAWSUIT, IF NEED BE, AND BRING THIS THING TO A CONCLUSION ONE 10:21AM **15** WAY OR ANOTHER. AND WE WOULD REQUEST THAT THE COURT ORDER US 10:21AM **16** 10:21AM **17** TO GO BACK TO JUDGE FAULKNER AND SEE IF WE HAVE A CHANCE OF RESOLVING THIS SHORT OF TAKING A WEEK OR TWO OF YOUR TIME. 10:21AM **18** THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. NOW. BEFORE YOU GO BACK 10:21AM **19** TO JUDGE FAULKNER, THOUGH, YOU NEED MY CLAIM CONSTRUCTION, 10:21AM **20** 10:21AM **21** I ASSUME. OR AT LEAST THAT WOULD HELP, CERTAINLY. MR. KENDALL: MAY I BE HEARD ON THAT? 10:22AM **22**

MR. KENDALL: WELL, AS I SAID IN MY ARGUMENT,
THERE'S TWO SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT ON THAT. ONE IS, IF WE DON'T

THE COURT: SURE.

10:22AM **23**

10:22AM **24**

10:22AM **25**

14 HAVE IT, THERE'S ENOUGH UNCERTAINTY THERE ABOUT WHAT YOU ARE 10:22AM 1 GONNA DO THAT IT MAY FOSTER SETTLEMENT OR, IF WE HAVE IT, THEN 10:22AM 2 OBVIOUSLY WE WILL HAVE A CLEAR PICTURE. BUT, AGAIN, JUDGE, I'M 10:22AM **3** QUITE SURE THIS IS NOT THE ONLY CASE ON YOUR DOCKET AND NOT THE 10:22AM **4** ONLY THING YOU HAVE TO DO IS SIT AROUND, YOU KNOW, WATCHING THE 10:22AM **5** COMPUTER FOR THE NEXT RAYTHEON MOTION, RAYTHEON-INDIGO MOTION. 10:22AM **6** THE COURT: THAT IS TRUE. 10:22AM **7** 10:22AM **8** MR. KENDALL: AND SO. YOU KNOW. I WOULD HOPE THAT WE COULD SETTLE THE CASE AND SAVE US TIME, THE DEFENDANTS TIME, 10:22AM **9** AND SAVE YOU TIME AND EXPENSE BY GOING BACK IN EARLY JANUARY. 10:22AM **10** THE COURT: OKAY. 10:22AM **11** MR. KENDALL: I REALLY BELIEVE, JUDGE, THAT THIS 10:22AM **12** THING IS GONNA CONTINUE AS IT HAS THE LONGER WE PUT THE TRIAL 10:22AM **13** OFF AND JUST--WE'RE REQUESTING BRING THIS THING TO A HEAD AND 10:22AM **14** PUT US ALL OUT OF OUR MISERY AND LET'S TRY THIS THING IF WE 10:22AM **15** 10:22AM **16 HAVE TO**. 10:23AM **17** THE COURT: OKAY. MR. SIEBMAN: YOUR HONOR, CLYDE SIEBMAN. MAY I 10:23AM **18** RESPOND? 10:23AM **19** THE COURT: SURE. YEAH, GO AHEAD. 10:23AM **20** 10:23AM **21** MR. SIEBMAN: THE PROBLEM WITH WHAT MR. KENDALL IS SUGGESTING IS THAT WE'VE BEEN TRYING TO TAKE THEIR DAMAGE 10:23AM **22** EXPERT'S DEPOSITION SINCE I THINK SEPTEMBER. SOMEONE CORRECT 10:23AM **23** ME IF I'M WRONG. BUT SINCE SEPTEMBER WE'VE BEEN TRYING TO TAKE 10:23AM **24** THIS GENTLEMAN'S DEPOSITION. AND IT'S BEEN A LITANY OF EXCUSES 10:23AM **25**

10:23AM **1**

10:23AM **2**

10:23AM **3**

10:23AM **4**

10:23AM **5**

10:23AM **6**

10:23AM **7**

10:23AM **8**

10:23AM **9**

10:23AM **10**

10:23AM **11**

10:23AM **12**

10:24AM **13**

10:24AM **14**

10:24AM **15**

10:24AM **16**

10:24AM **17**

10:24AM **18**

10:24AM **19**

10:24AM **20**

10:24AM **21**

10:24AM **22**

10:24AM **23**

10:24AM **24**

10:24AM **25**

ON WHY WE CAN'T TAKE THEIR DAMAGES EXPERT'S DEPOSITION, MR. BRADDOCK.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IS THERE A MOTION ON THAT? MR. SIEBMAN: NO. WE'VE BEEN TRYING TO WORK WITH THE SCHEDULE, TO WORK WITH OPPOSING COUNSEL TO GET THAT DEPOSITION TAKEN. I MEAN, FIRST, I THINK HE WAS ILL; THEN HE HAD AN ILLNESS IN THE FAMILY: THEN HE HAD SOME SCHEDULING PROBLEMS. AND WE'VE BEEN TRYING TO WORK WITH THEM TO GET THIS DEPOSITION TAKEN. AND THAT'S THE REASON THAT THIS SCHEDULE REALLY HAS BEEN ROLLING IS BECAUSE OF--AND EVERYBODY IS WORKING TOGETHER. I MEAN THERE'S A TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF WORK TO DO IN THIS CASE. AND ALTHOUGH, YOU KNOW, THERE HAVE BEEN A LOT OF CONTENTIOUS ISSUES IN THE CASE, IN SOME RESPECTS WE'VE BEEN TRYING TO WORK AND IN THAT REGARD WE'VE BEEN WORKING WITH THEM TO TOGETHER. TRY TO GET MR. BRADDOCK'S DEPOSITION FOR A LONG, LONG TIME AND UNTIL WE'RE NOW TO THE POINT WHERE THEY SAY HE CAN'T BE AVAILABLE UNTIL MID-DECEMBER. THAT'S THE REASON THAT THE--THAT THE--THE EXPERT STUFF HAS BEEN PUSHED INTO DECEMBER AFTER THE JOINT PRETRIAL DATE.

THE PROBLEM WITH THAT NOW IS THAT THERE IS--WE
BELIEVE--WE'RE GONNA PRESENT TO THE COURT A VERY SERIOUS
DISPOSITIVE MOTION ON DAMAGES THAT WE CAN'T FILE UNTIL WE GET
THIS EXPERT'S DEPOSITION. AND THE COURT IS GOING TO HAVE TO
HAVE A REASONABLE AMOUNT OF TIME TO ADDRESS THAT. IT REALLY-SOMETHING WAS--I WAS REMINDED OF SOMETHING THAT MR. CUNNINGHAM

SAID IN ONE OF THE FIRST HEARINGS THAT WE HAD IN THIS CASE. I 10:24AM 1 THOUGHT IT WAS ODD AT THE TIME, AND NOW IT'S MAKING MORE SENSE 10:24AM 2 TO ME. HE MADE THE COMMENT TO THE COURT THAT THIS CASE WAS 10:25AM REALLY JUST AS SIMPLE AS A DOG-BITE CASE. AND I THINK THAT'S 10:25AM **4** THE WAY THEY WANT TO TRY IT. THEY REALLY--THEY DON'T WANT 10:25AM **5** TO TRY THIS CASE IN AN ORDERLY FASHION AFTER IT'S BEEN FULLY 10:25AM 6 10:25AM **7** PREPARED AND EVERYONE HAS HAD A FULL OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT THEIR MOTIONS AND PRESENT THIS CASE AS YOU WOULD NORMALLY A 10:25AM **8** PATENT CASE. THEY SIMPLY WANT TO--TO PRESENT THEIR ARGUMENTS 10:25AM **9** TO A JURY AND SEE WHAT STICKS. AND THAT WOULD BE AN EXTREME 10:25AM **10** INJUSTICE TO THE DEFENDANTS IN THIS CASE WHERE THE PLAINTIFFS 10:25AM **11** ARE SEEKING MILLIONS AND MILLIONS OF DOLLARS IN DAMAGES ON 10:25AM **12** THEORIES THAT WE THINK WILL--WILL NOT HOLD WATER. 10:25AM **13** THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MR. SIEBMAN, WHAT DO YOU 10:25AM **14** THINK THE COURT NEEDS TO RULE ON RIGHT NOW IN ORDER TO HELP THE 10:25AM **15** DEFENDANTS MOVE FORWARD WITH THE CASE AND TO GET READY FOR ANY 10:25AM **16** 10:26AM **17** FURTHER MEDIATION WITH JUDGE FAULKNER? MR. SIEBMAN: I THINK THE MARKMAN ORDER IS EXTREMELY 10:26AM **18** IMPORTANT. 10:26AM **19** 10:26AM **20** THE COURT: YEAH. OKAY. MR. SIEBMAN: I THINK THE MOTION--THE PLAINTIFF'S 10:26AM **21** MOTION TO EXPAND THEIR INFRINGEMENT CONTENTIONS IS EXTREMELY 10:26AM **22** IMPORTANT. THEY'RE ATTEMPTING AT THIS LATE DATE TO EXPAND 10:26AM **23** THEIR INFRINGEMENT CONTENTIONS IN THE CASE. AND IF YOU THINK 10:26AM **24**

BACK TO WHAT MR. KENDALL JUST SUGGESTED, HE SUGGESTED TO YOU

10:26AM **25**

17 THAT WE SHOULD BE READY TO GO IN ABOUT SIX WEEKS ON A CASE 10:26AM 1 WHERE WE DON'T EVEN KNOW YET WHAT THE PLAINTIFF'S PATENT 10:26AM 2 INFRINGEMENT CONTENTIONS ARE IN ADDITION TO THE -- TO THE 10:26AM **3** CLAIM CONSTRUCTION. SO I THINK THOSE TWO THINGS ARE--10:26AM **4** THE COURT: OKAY. 10:26AM **5** MR. SIEBMAN: --EXTREMELY IMPORTANT. BUT CAN I 10:26AM 6 10:26AM **7** ALSO ASK FOR INPUT FROM MY TEAM? BECAUSE THAT'S A PRETTY BROAD QUESTION. 10:26AM **8** MR. STEINBERG: YOUR HONOR, THIS IS BOB STEINBERG, 10:26AM **9** 10:26AM 10 IF I COULD ADD TO THAT. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 10:26AM **11** MR. STEINBERG: YOUR HONOR, THERE IS A REAL 10:26AM **12** PRACTICAL TIMING ISSUE HERE, PARTICULARLY WITH REGARD TO THE 10:26AM **13** MARKMAN RULING AND THE PIC. THE MARKMAN RULING WILL ENABLE 10:27AM **14** BOTH PARTIES, ACTUALLY, TO SUPPLEMENT THEIR NEW ARGUMENTS BASED 10:27AM **15** ON WHAT THOSE CONSTRUCTIONS TURN OUT TO BE. AND THAT WILL 10:27AM **16** TRIGGER PROBABLY ADDITIONAL DISCOVERY BECAUSE THOSE SUPPLEMENTAL 10:27AM **17** 10:27AM **18** REPORTS WILL REQUIRE FURTHER INQUIRY. IN ADDITION, YOUR RULING ON THE PICS, ADDING NEW 10:27AM **19** PRODUCTS THAT WEREN'T IN THE CASE, THIS MOTION FOR LEAVE TO 10:27AM **20** ADD THESE NEW PARTS AND THEORIES TO THE CASE WAS PROVIDED ONLY 10:27AM **21** WHEN THE PARTIES WERE ACTUALLY EXCHANGING EXPERT REPORTS. 10:27AM **22** DEFENDANTS DID NOT HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE ISSUES 10:27AM **23** 10:27AM **24** CONCERNING THESE NEW ALLEGATIONS AND THEORIES, FRANKLY, THAT WERE IN THE NEW PICS. SO AGAIN THERE WE ALSO WILL PROBABLY 10:27AM **25**

10:27AM 1

10:27AM 2

10:28AM **3**

10:28AM **4**

10:28AM **5**

10:28AM **6**

10:28AM **7**

10:28AM **8**

10:28AM **9**

10:28AM **10**

10:28AM **11**

10:28AM **13**

10:28AM **14**

10:28AM **15**

10:28AM **16**

10:28AM **17**

10:29AM **18**

10:29AM **19**

10:29AM **20**

10:29AM **21**

10:29AM **22**

10:29AM **23**

10:29AM **24**

10:29AM **25**

HAVE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO SUPPLEMENT IN THE REPORT.

NOW, ALL OF THAT IN COMBINATION WITH THE TIMING TO FILE PROBABLY SUBSTANTIVE AND DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT BASED ON THE NEW PICS AND THE CLAIM CONSTRUCTIONS WILL PUSH THE TIMELINE WELL BEYOND JANUARY 20TH, PRACTICALLY SPEAKING.

SO WHILE I AGREE IT WOULD BE VERY HELPFUL FOR US, BOTH PARTIES. TO HAVE THE CONSTRUCTION NOW. I DON'T SEE HOW THAT DATE FOR THE PATENT SIDE OF THE CASE IN PARTICULAR CAN BE MAINTAINED AT THIS TIME.

MR. KENDALL: YOUR HONOR, JOE KENDALL. MAY I BE 10:28AM 12 | HEARD ON THESE ISSUES?

> THE COURT: YES, BUT, YOU KNOW--I'LL BE HAPPY TO HEAR FROM YOU, MR. KENDALL, BUT I DON'T KNOW IF THIS IS REALLY GONNA HELP ME, BECAUSE YOU ALL KNOW SO MUCH MORE ABOUT THE DETAILS ABOUT WHERE YOU ARE IN THE CASE AND I DON'T. YOU KNOW, FROM MY STANDPOINT, IT'S JUST A MATTER OF: WHAT DO I ADDRESS NEXT ON MY DOCKET? AND THERE'S ALWAYS SOMETHING DEMANDING ATTENTION. I WANT TO--I WANT TO GIVE ATTENTION TO THIS CASE.

AND I'LL JUST TELL YOU, HERE'S MY SITUATION: I CAN'T DO MUCH MORE ON THIS CASE IN THE MONTH OF NOVEMBER, LOOKING AT MY SCHEDULE. I JUST FINISHED A TRIAL YESTERDAY AND I CAN TELL YOU SEPTEMBER, OCTOBER, NOVEMBER HAVE ALL BEEN VERY BUSY WITH TRIALS AND SENTENCINGS AND MOTION WORK.

I HAVE--AFTER WE HANG UP FROM THIS CALL, I'VE GOT TO

GET READY FOR A CLE PROGRAM TOMORROW THAT I HAVE GOT TO BE IN. 10:29AM 1

> THEN I HAVE 12 SENTENCINGS ON FRIDAY AND I HAVE A NUMBER OF SENTENCINGS NEXT WEEK BEFORE THANKSGIVING.

SO THAT PUTS ME INTO DECEMBER, WHEN I HAVE FINAL PRETRIALS ON MONDAY, THE 1ST, AND THEN I HAVE FOUR CRIMINAL CASES SET FOR JURY TRIAL BEFORE CHRISTMAS. HOPEFULLY SOME OF THOSE WILL PLEA. I JUST DON'T KNOW. AND HOPEFULLY I'LL FIND SOME TIME AROUND THE HOLIDAYS TO WORK ON THIS.

BUT WHAT I'M HOPING TO DO IS GET THE CLAIM-CONSTRUCTION RULING TO YOU IN DECEMBER, AND ALSO A RULING ON DOCKET ENTRY 66, WHICH IS THE DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON VARIOUS CLAIMS; AND DOCKET ENTRY 234, WHICH IS DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR SANCTIONS ON SPOLIATION; AND DOCKET ENTRY 276, WHICH IS THE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO SUPPLEMENT PATENT-INFRINGEMENT CONTENTIONS; AND THEN DOCKET ENTRY 336, WHICH IS THE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO STRIKE DEFENDANTS' ANSWER TO THE AMENDED COMPLAINT.

NOW, BEGINNING WITH DOCKET ENTRY 352, WHICH IS A MOTION BY THE PLAINTIFF TO STRIKE TRANSCRIPT ERRATA SHEETS OF JONATHAN KNAUTH AND VU NGUYEN, THOSE--I DON'T KNOW IF ALL THE RESPONSES AND REPLIES HAVE COME IN YET. THAT WAS FILED NOVEMBER 3RD. SO THERE'S A LOT OF STUFF THAT'S NEW. BUT SOME OF THIS OLD STUFF THAT'S BEEN PENDING, I WOULD LIKE TO GET RULINGS TO YOU AS QUICKLY AS POSSIBLE.

YOU KNOW, I WANT YOU TO KEEP WORKING ON THE CASE.

10:30AM

10:30AM 3

2

10:30AM **4**

10:30AM **5**

10:30AM 6

10:30AM 7

10:30AM **8**

10:30AM **9**

10:30AM **10**

10:30AM **11**

10:30AM **12**

10:31AM **13**

10:31AM **14**

10:31AM **15**

10:31AM **16**

10:31AM **17**

10:31AM **18**

10:31AM **19**

10:31AM **20**

10:31AM **21**

10:31AM **22**

10:31AM **23**

10:31AM **24**

10:32AM **25**

1 I'M READY TO TRY THE CASE IN JANUARY. I STILL HAVE THAT DATE

10:32AM 2 ON MY CALENDAR AND I HAVEN'T SCHEDULED OVER IT OR ANYTHING. I

10:32AM 3 MEAN I'VE CLEARED MY CALENDAR FOR TUESDAY, JANUARY 20TH. BUT

10:32AM 4 I KNOW THAT IT'S INHIBITING BOTH SIDES' ABILITY TO PREPARE FOR

10:32AM 5 TRIAL BECAUSE YOU DON'T HAVE MY CLAIM-CONSTRUCTION RULING AND

10:32AM 6 MY RULING ON--RULINGS ON SOME OF THESE MOTIONS THAT I JUST WENT

VOICE: YOUR HONOR--

THE COURT: SO IF I GO AHEAD AND TRY TO GET THOSE RULINGS TO YOU IN DECEMBER, THEN, I GUESS, AS YOU FILE MORE MOTIONS, I'LL JUST HAVE TO TRY TO DO SOMETHING WITH THEM AS THEY COME MY WAY. IT COULD BE WE WOULD GO INTO TRIAL AND I WOULD HAVE A STACK OF MOTIONS THAT I JUST HAVEN'T GOTTEN TO. I'M NOT SURE HOW THAT WILL PLAY OUT.

MR. SIEBMAN: YOUR HONOR, THIS IS CLYDE SIEBMAN.

IF I MIGHT ADDRESS THE COURT BRIEFLY, I THINK IF THE COURT

WILL LOOK AT THE MOST-RECENT SCHEDULE AND HAVE THE LAW CLERK

CALCULATE THE RESPONSE DATES ON THOSE MOTIONS, WHAT THE COURT

IS GONNA FIND IS THAT THE DAUBERT MOTIONS ON DAMAGES AND THE

DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS ON DAMAGES ARE GONNA BE FILED EITHER ON THE

EVE OF TRIAL OR EVEN ARE GONNA BE DUE TO BE FILED RIGHT AFTER

THE 20TH.

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. NOW, I'M LOOKING AT MY

NOVEMBER 4TH ORDER. I THINK THAT'S WHAT YOU ARE REFERRING TO.

MR. SIEBMAN: RIGHT. I THINK IT'S THE 26TH.

10:33AM **25**

10:33AM **24**

10:32AM **7**

10:32AM **8**

10:32AM **9**

10:32AM **10**

10:32AM **11**

10:32AM **12**

10:33AM **13**

10:33AM **14**

10:33AM **15**

10:33AM **16**

10:33AM **17**

10:33AM **18**

10:33AM **19**

10:33AM **20**

10:33AM **21**

10:33AM **22**

10:33AM **23**

OVER WITH YOU.

22 THE 19TH OF DECEMBER. THIS IS STILL ROBERT GARNER SPEAKING. 10:34AM 1 THE COURT: OKAY. 10:35AM 2 MR. SIEBMAN: BEEN TRYING TO TAKE BRADDOCK'S SINCE 10:35AM **3** SEPTEMBER. 10:35AM **4** MR. CUNNINGHAM: ROSS CUNNINGHAM, YOUR HONOR. 10:35AM **5** MR. BRADDOCK HAD A DEATH IN THE FAMILY, NOT AN ILLNESS; HE HAD 6 10:35AM TWO SURGERIES; HIS OFFICE WAS DISPLACED BY HURRICANE--I DON'T 10:35AM 7 KNOW WHAT THE NAME OF IT WAS. 10:35AM **8** VOICE: IKE. 10:35AM **9** 10:35AM **10** THE COURT: OKAY. 10:35AM **11** MR. CUNNINGHAM: HE'S BEEN SUMMONSED TO TRIAL IN NEW JERSEY ONCE AND CALIFORNIA A SECOND TIME. 10:35AM **12** THE COURT: OKAY. SO RIGHT NOW YOU'VE SCHEDULED 10:35AM **13** BRADDOCK'S DEPOSITION FOR DECEMBER 17TH AND SCHLAGE'S FOR 10:35AM **14** DECEMBER 19TH? 10:35AM **15** 10:35AM **16** MR. GARNER: ROBERT GARNER. THAT IS CORRECT, YOUR 10:35AM **17** HONOR. THE COURT: OKAY. 10:35AM **18** MR. SIEBMAN: THE POINT I WAS MAKING, YOUR HONOR, 10:35AM **19** IS THAT WITH THE PROBLEMS THAT MR. BRADDOCK HAD--AND THAT'S 10:35AM **20** RAYTHEON'S EXPERT--WITH THE PROBLEMS THAT HE HAD AND PUSHING--10:35AM **21** AND PREVENTING--AND WE DIDN'T FILE MOTIONS WITH THE COURT 10:35AM **22** BECAUSE, I MEAN, YOU KNOW, THOSE WERE LEGITIMATE EXCUSES, I 10:35AM **23** MEAN, YOU KNOW, IT WOULD HAVE BEEN--IT WOULD HAVE BEEN--I JUST 10:35AM **24** WOULDN'T HAVE FELT GOOD; IT WOULDN'T HAVE BEEN APPROPRIATE FOR 10:36AM **25**

10:36AM **1**

10:36AM **2**

10:36AM **3**

10:36AM **4**

10:36AM **5**

10:36AM **6**

10:36AM **7**

10:36AM **8**

10:36AM **9**

10:36AM **10**

10:36AM **11**

10:36AM **12**

10:36AM **13**

10:37AM **14**

10:37AM **15**

10:37AM **16**

10:37AM **17**

10:37AM **18**

10:37AM **19**

10:37AM **20**

10:37AM **21**

10:37AM **22**

10:37AM **23**

10:37AM **24**

10:37AM **25**

US TO FILE MOTIONS ON THAT. IT WAS APPROPRIATE FOR US TO AGREE THAT THOSE WERE LEGITIMATE PROBLEMS.

BUT BE THAT AS IT MAY, IT HAS FORCED US INTO A SITUATION WHERE WE'RE NOW GETTING TO TAKE THE DAMAGE EXPERT IN A MULTI-MILLION-DOLLAR CASE WITHIN 30 DAYS OF WHEN THE TRIAL IS SET IN A CASE WHERE WE HAVE SERIOUS ISSUES WITH THE DAMAGE METHODOLOGY.

AND YOU KNOW, I UNDERSTAND MR. KENDALL'S COMMENT THAT HE JUST WANTS TO THROW THIS THING IN THE JURY BOX. BUT THAT WOULD BE TOTALLY UNFAIR TO THE DEFENDANTS IN A CASE OF THIS MAGNITUDE WHEN WE'VE BEEN PREVENTED, ALBEIT FOR GOOD REASONS, FROM TAKING THE DAMAGE EXPERT IN THIS CASE IN TIME TO--TO MAKE--YOU KNOW, IF--IF THE END RESULT IS WE CAN'T MAKE MEANINGFUL OBJECTIONS TO THIS FELLOW BECAUSE THE COURT IS NOT GONNA HAVE A FAIR AMOUNT OF TIME TO ADDRESS THE ISSUES, THEN THAT WOULD BE--YOU KNOW, THAT WOULD BE TOTALLY UNFAIR TO THE DEFENDANTS. YOU KNOW, IT'S NOT OUR FAULT THAT WE'RE--THAT WE'RE NOT ABLE TO TAKE MR. BRADDOCK, THE DAMAGE EXPERT, UNTIL THE END OF DECEMBER.

THE COURT: WELL, NOW, YOU WOULD HAVE THE

OPPORTUNITY TO FILE YOUR DAUBERT MOTION ON BRADDOCK NO LATER

THAN, IT LOOKS LIKE, DECEMBER 24TH, RIGHT, SEVEN DAYS AFTER

12/17?

MR. SIEBMAN: RIGHT. I SUPPOSE THAT'S RIGHT. I
THOUGHT IT WAS THE 26TH, BUT IT MAY BE THE 24TH.

24 VOICE: IT'S THE 26TH, YOUR HONOR. 10:37AM 1 THE COURT: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. 10:37AM 2 MR. KENDALL: YOUR HONOR, THIS IS JOE KENDALL. MAY 10:37AM **3** I BE HEARD NOW? 10:37AM **4** THE COURT: OKAY. GO AHEAD. 10:37AM **5** MR. KENDALL: THIS BUSINESS ABOUT THIS IS SOME KIND 10:37AM 6 10:37AM **7** OF COMPLICATED DOG-BITE CASE, ALL I CAN TELL YOU IS YOU CAN PROBABLY DO THE SAME THING IN ELECTRONIC FORMAT. I'M KIND OF 10:37AM **8** AN OLD-SCHOOL PAPER GUY. I LIKE TO READ PAPER. I'M LOOKING 10:37AM **9** ACROSS THE ROOM HERE AT AN ENTIRE SHELF FULL OF DEAD TREES THAT 10:37AM **10** HAVE BEEN GENERATED IN THIS CASE. SO TO SUGGEST THE NOTION 10:38AM **11** THAT THIS THING HASN'T BEEN FULLY LITIGATED AND IT HASN'T BEEN 10:38AM **12** LITIGATED AD NAUSEAM IS JUST ERRONEOUS. 10:38AM **13** WITH REGARD TO BRADDOCK'S MOTION--OR THE MOTION WITH 10:38AM **14** REGARD TO BRADDOCK, THAT THING CAN BE RIPE--IF YOU CAN SHORTEN 10:38AM **15** THE TIME ON US, WE'LL RESPOND TO WHATEVER THEY FILE ABOUT HIM 10:38AM **16** 10:38AM **17** REAL QUICKLY. AND IT WOULD PROBABLY TAKE THE COURT HOWEVER QUICK THE COURT CAN READ 10 TO 20 PAGES TO FIGURE THIS OUT. 10:38AM **18** THIS IS NOT ROCKET SCIENCE. 10:38AM **19** AND ONCE AGAIN--AND I FORGET NOW WHICH DEFENSE 10:38AM **20** LAWYER, IT WASN'T MR. SIEBMAN, BUT ONE CHIMED IN--AND THIS IS 10:38AM **21** VERY, VERY TELLING, WHEN HE SAID--AND YOU CAN GO BACK IN THE 10:38AM **22** RECORD AND LOOK--ONE OF THESE GENTLEMEN SAID, "OH, YES, AND 10:38AM **23** ONCE YOU ISSUE YOUR MARKMAN RULING, THAT WILL GENERATE 10:38AM **24** ADDITIONAL MOTIONS THAT WE WILL NEED TO FILE." AND SO WE SEE 10:38AM **25**

THIS--AND WE--YOU KNOW, WE WANT TO BE PREPARED AS WELL AND WE 10:39AM 1 WANT THEM TO BE PREPARED AS WELL AND YOU BEST BELIEVE WE'RE NOT 10:39AM 2 GONNA GO UP AND THROW A BUNCH OF STUFF AGAINST THE WALL AND HOPE THAT IT STICKS. BUT THIS IS A PRINCETON DEFENSE, DELAY, DELAY, DELAY, WE JUST WANT TO GO TO TRIAL ON JANUARY 20TH, WE WOULD LIKE TO MEDIATE BEFORE THEN IF THERE'S A CHANCE TO 6 SETTLE. IT WILL BE FAIRLY CLEAR TO ALL CONCERNED WHAT THE LAY 7 OF THE LAND IS BY EARLY JANUARY. AND THE HOLIDAYS WILL BE OVER. THIS IS A BIG-ENOUGH CASE, THERE ARE ENOUGH LAWYERS INVOLVED, A COUPLE OF WEEKS, TWO TO THREE WEEKS THERE WITH PEOPLE WHO HAVE BEEN LIVING WITH THIS FOR A YEAR THAT DON'T

> AND ONCE AGAIN, YOUR HONOR, I WOULD JUST SUGGEST TO YOU THAT IF THE TRIAL SETTING IS PUSHED YOU ARE JUST GONNA HAVE MORE DOCKET ENTRIES AND IT'S JUST GONNA KEEP GOING UNTIL YOU PUT AN END TO IT.

> > THE COURT: OKAY.

MR. SIEBMAN: YOUR HONOR, I DON'T THINK IT'S FAIR TO SUGGEST THAT THE DEFENDANTS ARE DELAYING. IT'S BEEN MR. BRADDOCK'S SCHEDULE THAT'S BEEN THE TRUE IMPEDIMENT, AND THAT'S THE PLAINTIFF'S EXPERT. SO...

THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. SO, MR. SIEBMAN, WHAT--OTHER THAN BRADDOCK'S DEPOSITION AND SCHLAGE--AND I DON'T KNOW IF I'M PRONOUNCING HIS NAME CORRECTLY, I'M SURE I'M NOT--OTHER THAN

10:39AM 10:39AM 10:39AM **5** 10:39AM 10:39AM 10:39AM **8** 10:39AM **9** 10:39AM **10** 10:39AM **11** REALLY NEED TO GO OUT AND REINVENT THE WHEEL. THERE IS MORE 10:39AM **12** THAN ADEQUATE TIME TO TRY THIS CASE. 10:39AM **13**

10:39AM **14** 10:39AM **15**

10:39AM **16**

10:40AM **17**

10:40AM **18**

10:40AM **19**

10:40AM **20**

10:40AM **21**

10:40AM **22**

10:40AM **23**

10:40AM **24**

10:40AM **25**

Case 4:07-cv-00109-RAS Document 396 Filed 12/11/08 Page 26 of 39 PageID #: 18658 26 THOSE TWO DEPOSITIONS--AND BY THE WAY, THOSE ARE BOTH DAMAGES 10:40AM 1 EXPERTS FOR THE PLAINTIFF, MR. KENDALL? 10:40AM 2 MR. KENDALL: YES. NO, NOT SCHLAGE. HE'S THE 10:40AM **3** DEFENDANTS', AS I UNDERSTAND IT. 10:40AM **4** THE COURT: OKAY. HE'S YOUR EXPERT, MR. SIEBMAN, 10:40AM **5** SCHLAGE IS? 10:40AM **6** 10:40AM **7** MR. SIEBMAN: THE PLAINTIFF'S AND THE DEFENDANTS' EXPERTS HAVE BEEN PUT OFF TO WHERE THEY CAN BE TAKEN 10:40AM **8** SIMULTANEOUSLY, YOU KNOW, IN THE SAME PERIOD OF TIME. 10:40AM **9** THE COURT: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. SO SCHLAGE IS YOUR 10:40AM **10** MAN? 10:40AM **11** MR. SIEBMAN: YES. AND BRADDOCK IS THEIRS. 10:40AM **12** REASON WE'RE AT THE END OF DECEMBER IS BECAUSE OF BRADDOCK'S 10:41AM **13** 10:41AM **14** | **SCHEDULE**. THE COURT: YEAH. OKAY. ALL RIGHT. SO YOU NEED TO 10:41AM **15** 10:41AM 16 DO THAT. AND WHAT ELSE DO YOU NEED NOW IN ORDER TO GO FORWARD? 10:41AM **17** I KNOW YOU NEED THE MARKMAN RULING, OR YOU WOULD LIKE IT, AND YOU WOULD LIKE MY RULING ON THE MOTION--LET'S SEE--THE MOTION 10:41AM **18** FOR LEAVE TO SUPPLEMENT PATENT-INFRINGEMENT CONTENTIONS FILED 10:41AM **19** BY THE PLAINTIFF. OKAY? YOU NEED THOSE TWO THINGS. THOSE ARE 10:41AM **20** THE MOST IMPORTANT IS WHAT I'M HEARING FROM BOTH SIDES HERE. 10:41AM **21** MR. SIEBMAN: IN GOING FORWARD, THAT'S CORRECT. 10:41AM **22** OBVIOUSLY THE MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT THAT THE DEFENDANTS 10:41AM **23**

THE COURT: YEAH. AND THAT'S DOCKET ENTRY 66,

HAVE ON FILE--

10:41AM **24**

10:41AM **25**

27 1 RIGHT? 10:41AM MR. SIEBMAN: --WOULD BE VERY IMPORTANT. 10:41AM **2** MR. CUNNINGHAM: YOUR HONOR, MR. CUNNINGHAM. THE 10:41AM **3** DEFENDANTS FILED A MOTION TO WITHDRAW DOCKET NUMBER 66 ON 10:41AM **4** NOVEMBER 3RD. THEY REPLACED IT WITH--IT WAS A PRE-DISCOVERY 10:41AM **5** MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON LIMITATION. ON NOVEMBER 3RD, 10:41AM **6** 10:42AM **7** THEY WITHDREW THAT MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND REPLACED 10:42AM **8** IT WITH A VIRTUALLY IDENTICAL MOTION. BUT THEY THEN INCLUDED EVIDENCE THAT CAME OUT DURING THE YEAR OF DISCOVERY. 10:42AM **9** 10:42AM **10** MR. SIEBMAN: THE NUMBER HAS CHANGED, BUT THE 10:42AM 11 SUBSTANCE OF THAT MOTION IS VERY SIMILAR. THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. IT WOULD JUST BE HELPFUL 10:42AM **12** 10:42AM 13 FOR ME TO IDENTIFY WHICH NUMBER WE'RE TALKING ABOUT. MR. SIEBMAN: IF THE COURT WOULD LIKE, WE COULD 10:42AM **14** 10:42AM 15 PREPARE A LETTER AND SEND IT OVER TO THE COURT BY FIRST THING IN THE MORNING. 10:42AM **16** THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. THAT WOULD HELP. I'M 10:42AM **17** 10:42AM 18 LOOKING HERE. IT MAY BE NUMBER 357. DO YOU KNOW, KEITH? LAW CLERK: I DON'T KNOW. 10:42AM **19** THE COURT: DO YOU RECALL A MOTION TO WITHDRAW? 10:42AM **20** LAW CLERK: I DON'T RECALL SEEING THAT. 10:42AM **21** MR. CUNNINGHAM: YOUR HONOR, MR. CUNNINGHAM. THE 10:42AM **22** DEFENDANTS FILED A MOTION ON THE--ON THE-ON THE NIGHT OF 10:42AM **23** 10:42AM **24** NOVEMBER 3RD THAT WAS--THEY WITHDREW DOCKET NUMBER 66 AND THEN IN EITHER A COMPANION MOTION OR ON THE SAME MOTION THEY 10:42AM **25**

28 WERE ASKING TO RESET THE PAGE LIMITS ON THE TOTAL OF BRIEFING 10:42AM 1 OF 60 PAGES. 2 10:43AM THE COURT: OKAY. THERE ARE A NUMBER OF MOTIONS 10:43AM **3** FILED ON NOVEMBER 3RD. 10:43AM **4** MR. SIEBMAN: LET ME EXPLAIN THAT, YOUR HONOR, SO 10:43AM **5** YOU'LL UNDERSTAND WHAT HAPPENED. WE FILED AN INITIAL MOTION AT 6 10:43AM 10:43AM **7** THE--AT THE BEGINNING OF DISCOVERY. THAT GOT CARRIED FORWARD. 10:43AM **8** AND SO WHAT WE DID IN NOVEMBER WAS WE FILED ANOTHER MOTION THAT WOULD BASICALLY SUBSUME THAT INITIAL--INSTEAD OF THE COURT 10:43AM **9** HAVING TWO MOTIONS, WE PUT EVERYTHING IN THAT OLD MOTION IN THE 10:43AM **10** SECOND MOTION. 10:43AM **11** THE COURT: OKAY. 10:43AM **12** MR. SIEBMAN: WE--WE--WE INCLUDED ADDITIONAL 10:43AM **13** 10:43AM 14 EVIDENCE THAT HAD BEEN LEARNED DURING DISCOVERY--THE COURT: OKAY. 10:43AM **15** MR. SIEBMAN: --THAT WE CONTENDED SUPPORTED THE 10:43AM **16** 10:43AM **17 MOTION**. THE COURT: OKAY. THEN WHAT I NEED TO DO IS NOT--SO 10:43AM **18** YOU DON'T NEED A RULING ON 66, BECAUSE YOU'VE REPLACED IT WITH 10:43AM **19** SOMETHING ELSE. AND IT LOOKS LIKE PROBABLY YOU'VE REPLACED IT 10:43AM **20** WITH 357. 10:43AM **21** MR. SIEBMAN: IS THAT CORRECT, ROB? 10:43AM **22** MR. GARNER: ROBERT GARNER, YOUR HONOR, FOR 10:43AM **23** DEFENDANTS. I DON'T HAVE THAT NUMBER IN FRONT ME, BUT IT IS 10:43AM **24** REPLACED AND IT IS NOT FULLY--IT'S NOT RIPE YET. BUT I THINK 10:44AM **25**

1 10:44AM

2 10:44AM

10:44AM **3**

10:44AM **4**

10:44AM **5**

10:44AM **6**

10:44AM **7**

10:44AM **8**

10:44AM **9**

10:44AM **11**

10:44AM **12**

10:44AM **13**

10:44AM **14**

10:45AM **15**

10:45AM **16**

10:45AM **17**

10:45AM **18**

10:45AM **19**

10:45AM **20**

10:45AM **21**

10:45AM **22**

10:45AM **24**

MR. SIEBMAN'S SUGGESTION THAT WE PROVIDE YOU WITH A MORE ORGANIZED CHART OF WHAT'S PENDING AND WHERE THINGS ARE IN THE MORNING MIGHT BE THE BEST WAY TO GO.

THE COURT: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. I WILL--AS SOON AS I GET THAT CHART, I WILL LOOK AT IT AND SEE, YOU KNOW, WHAT'S THE MOST IMPORTANT HERE FOR ME TO GET GOING ON. AND I'M GOING TO START WITH THE MARKMAN ORDER AND THE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO SUPPLEMENT THEIR PATENT-INFRINGEMENT CONTENTIONS.

NOW, CAN YOU KEEP GOING FORWARD WITH WHAT'S IN THE 10:44AM 10 NOVEMBER 4TH ORDER HERE?

> MR. SIEBMAN: YOUR HONOR, THERE'S A COUPLE OF THINGS THAT WE REALLY WOULD NEED. WE--WE NEED--WHAT WE WOULD ASK FOR WOULD BE AT LEAST ONE OR TWO DAYS ADDITIONAL ON THE JOINT FINAL PRETRIAL ORDER. IF THE COURT IS INCLINED TO HAVE US FILE A JOINT FINAL PRETRIAL ORDER AT THIS POINT, WE WOULD LIKE AT LEAST A COUPLE-DAY EXTENSION ON THAT. AND THEN ALSO WE WOULD LIKE A WEEK EXTENSION ON THE PENDING--ON THE RESPONSES OR OPPOSITIONS THAT ARE DUE, I THINK, TODAY. IS THAT RIGHT, ROB?

> > MR. GARNER: THAT'S CORRECT.

VOICE: YOUR HONOR--

MR. SIEBMAN: I DON'T KNOW IF--BASED ON AN EARLIER COMMENT, I'M NOT SURE THAT THE DEFENDANTS--I MEAN THAT THE 10:45AM 23 PLAINTIFFS WOULD BE OPPOSED TO THAT.

MR. KENDALL: YOUR HONOR, JOE KENDALL. ONCE AGAIN, 10:45AM 25 WE ARE AMENABLE TO WHATEVER WORKS FOR EVERYONE AS LONG AS WE

30 GET TO TRY THIS CASE JANUARY 20 AND AS LONG AS WE GET A CRACK 10:45AM 1 WITH JUDGE FAULKNER AGAIN TO SEE IF WE CAN SAVE US ALL SOME 10:45AM 2 TIME. THAT'S THE ONLY HILL WE HAVE TO DIE ON. 10:45AM **3** THE COURT: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. 10:45AM **4** NOW, AS FAR AS THE FINAL PRETRIAL ORDER, WOULD THE 10:45AM **5** FINAL PRETRIAL ORDER BE MORE HELPFUL TO THE COURT AND TO YOU 6 10:45AM 10:45AM **7** IF IT CAME TO ME AFTER I GIVE YOU MY MARKMAN RULING? MR. GARNER: YOUR HONOR, ROBERT GARNER FOR DEFENDANTS 10:46AM **8** 10:46AM 9 | THAT'S CORRECT. 10:46AM **10** MR. KENDALL: JUDGE, JOE KENDALL. I WOULD AGREE WITH THAT. 10:46AM **11** THE COURT: OKAY. THEN--10:46AM **12** MR. GARNER: YOUR HONOR, ROBERT GARNER. IT WOULD 10:46AM **13** 10:46AM 14 ALSO BE HELPFUL IF IT CAME ALSO AFTER THE RULING ON THE PRELIMINARY INFRINGEMENT CONTENTIONS AS WELL. 10:46AM **15** THE COURT: OKAY. OKAY. LET'S SAY THE FINAL 10:46AM **16** PRETRIAL ORDER WILL BE DUE--AND I DON'T KNOW HOW QUICK TO MAKE 10:46AM **17** THIS, BUT CAN WE SAY 10 DAYS AFTER RULINGS ON THOSE TWO THINGS? 10:46AM **18** MR. SIEBMAN: YES, YOUR HONOR. I WAS GONNA SAY 10 10:46AM **19** BUSINESS DAYS, BUT A 10-DAY RULING WOULD BE 10 BUSINESS DAYS, 10:46AM **20** 10:46AM **21** SO THAT WOULD BE FINE. THE COURT: OKAY. 10 BUSINESS DAYS AFTER MARKMAN 10:46AM **22** 10:46AM 23 AND RULING ON PATENT-INFRINGEMENT CONTENTIONS. 10:47AM **24** OKAY. AS FAR AS--YOU MENTIONED SOMETHING ELSE ABOUT

SOME RESPONSES, MR. SIEBMAN, THAT YOU NEEDED ANOTHER FEW DAYS

10:47AM **25**

31 ON OR A WEEK OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT. 10:47AM 1 MR. SIEBMAN: THERE ARE SOME OPPOSITIONS, I THINK, 2 10:47AM ON MOTIONS THAT ARE DUE TODAY, AND WE WOULD LIKE TO EXTEND THAT 10:47AM 3 FOR A WEEK. 10:47AM **4** THE COURT: OKAY. 10:47AM **5** MR. KENDALL: WE HAVE NO OBJECTION TO THAT, YOUR 10:47AM 6 HONOR. 10:47AM **7** THE COURT: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. THOSE--I'LL GRANT 10:47AM **8** THAT REQUEST. AND I'LL PUT THIS IN A WRITTEN ORDER. 10:47AM **9** 10:47AM **10** RESPONSES TO MOTIONS THAT ARE DUE TODAY ARE EXTENDED TO, LET'S SEE, NOVEMBER 25TH. 10:47AM **11** OKAY. WHAT ELSE. MR. SIEBMAN? 10:47AM **12** MR. SIEBMAN: YOUR HONOR, I THINK THAT TAKES CARE 10:47AM **13** 10:47AM **14** OF THE IMMEDIATE. THE LAST COMMENT THAT I WOULD HAVE IS THAT THE MOST 10:47AM **15** IMPORTANT THING THAT WE NEED IS PROBABLY THE MOST DIFFICULT AND 10:48AM **16** 10:48AM **17** THAT IS THAT WE NEED THE COURT TO HAVE AN ADEQUATE AMOUNT OF TIME TO FULLY AND FAIRLY CONSIDER OUR OBJECTIONS TO THE DAMAGE 10:48AM **18** MODEL PRIOR TO THE TRIAL. 10:48AM **19** THE COURT: OKAY. 10:48AM **20** MR. SIEBMAN: AND, YOU KNOW, I DON'T KNOW--YOU KNOW, 10:48AM **21** I KNOW WHAT I TYPICALLY CONSIDER TO BE WHAT THE COURT NEEDS. 10:48AM **22** THE COURT KNOWS BETTER THAN I DO. BUT I THINK THAT'S THE 10:48AM **23** MOST-IMPORTANT ISSUE THAT WE HAVE THAT WOULD BE PENDING WOULD 10:48AM **24** BE--'CAUSE I THINK--IN A CASE OF THIS MAGNITUDE, I THINK IT IS 10:48AM **25**

10:48AM 1 EXTREMELY IMPORTANT FOR THE JUDGE AND FOR THE COURT TO FULFILL

2 | ITS--AND I KNOW YOU WILL, I'M NOT SUGGESTING YOU WON'T, BUT I

THINK IT IS IMPORTANT THAT YOU GIVE YOURSELF THE TIME THAT

10:48AM 4 YOU'RE TRULY GONNA NEED TO FULFILL YOUR ROLE AS A GATEKEEPER

10:48AM 5 ON THESE DAUBERT MOTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THIS DAMAGE MODEL.

THE COURT: ARE THESE MOTIONS THAT YOU HAVE ALREADY

FILED?

10:49AM 8 MR. SIEBMAN: THESE ARE MOTIONS THAT ARE REQUIRED TO

10:49AM 9 BE FILED, UNDER THE CURRENT SCHEDULE, SEVEN DAYS AFTER THESE

DAMAGE EXPERT DEPOS.

THE COURT: OKAY.

10:49AM 12 MR. SIEBMAN: AND THEREIN LIES THE REAL PROBLEM.

THEY'RE NOT GONNA BE FILED UNTIL THE END OF DECEMBER. AND,

YOU KNOW, THAT REALLY CREATES THE PROBLEM.

15 NOW, YOU KNOW, I HEAR MR. KENDALL TALKING ABOUT

JANUARY THE 20TH. BUT, YOU KNOW, IT MAY VERY WELL BE THAT WHAT

WE WOULD URGE THE COURT TO DO IS IF THE COURT CAN'T--AND I HAVE

A HARD TIME EVEN SAYING THIS BECAUSE I DON'T SEE HOW THE COURT

COULD HAVE THE TIME IN THAT WINDOW, BUT--BUT POSSIBLY, YOU

KNOW, WE COULD MOVE THE TRIAL DATE A SMALL AMOUNT AND--SUCH

THAT THE COURT WOULD HAVE THE TIME THAT IT NEEDS TO REVIEW

THESE GATEKEEPER MOTIONS.

10:49AM 23 MR. KENDALL: JOE KENDALL. MAY I BE HEARD, YOUR

10:49AM **24 HONOR?**

THE COURT: YES.

10:49AM 13
10:49AM 14
10:49AM 15
10:49AM 16
10:49AM 17
10:49AM 18
10:49AM 19
10:49AM 20

10:49AM **21**

10:49AM **22**

10:49AM **25**

10:48AM

10:49AM

10:49AM **7**

10:49AM **10**

10:49AM **11**

6

10:48AM **3**

10:49AM **1**

10:49AM **2**

10:49AM

10:50AM

10:50AM **5**

10:50AM **6**

10:50AM **7**

10:50AM **8**

10:50AM **9**

10:50AM **10**

10:50AM **11**

10:50AM **12**

10:50AM **13**

10:50AM **14**

10:50AM **15**

10:50AM **16**

10:50AM **17**

10:50AM **18**

10:50AM **19**

10:50AM **20**

10:51AM **21**

10:51AM **22**

10:51AM **23**

10:51AM **24**

10:51AM **25**

MR. KENDALL: IT'S GONNA TAKE YOU ABOUT AS LONG AS
IT TAKES TO READ WHAT WE SUBMIT. IT'S JUST THAT--MR. SIEBMAN
IS TRYING TO MAKE SOMETHING REAL COMPLEX AND MYSTERIOUS ABOUT
THIS. AND IT IS A ROUTINE DAUBERT RULING ON A GUY WHO IS A-THIS WON'T BE THE FIRST TIME HE'S TESTIFIED. LET ME JUST LEAVE
IT AT THAT.

THE COURT: ARE YOU TALKING ABOUT WALTER BRADDOCK?

MR. KENDALL: YES, SIR. AND SO TO SUGGEST THAT THIS

IS SOMETHING THAT'S GONNA REQUIRE TWO OR THREE WEEKS OF YOU

GOING INTO A CAVE SOMEWHERE OR GOING UP ON A MOUNTAINTOP AND

MEDITATING IS, IN OUR VIEW, NOT ACCURATE. AND ONCE AGAIN IT

COMES BACK TO WHAT I SAID WHAT, 45 MINUTES AGO NOW. THE REAL

DEAL IS THEY WANT TO DO ANYTHING OTHER THAN TRY THIS CASE ON

JANUARY 20TH. AND WE ARE AMENABLE TO CHANGING AND ALTERING

AGREED DATES AS RECENTLY AS TWO OR THREE WEEKS AGO, ON NOVEMBER

4, TO ACCOMMODATE THEM IN ANY AND EVERY WAY POSSIBLE AS LONG

AS WE PUT AN END TO THIS THING ON JANUARY 20TH ONE WAY OR THE

OTHER.

MR. SIEBMAN: YOUR HONOR, THAT MAY SOLVE THE PROBLEM.

IF THE COURT GETS THOSE MOTIONS AND THEY'RE THAT EASY TO RESOLVE

AND THE COURT RESOLVES THEM THAT QUICKLY, THEN I THINK IT CAN

BE DONE WITHIN THAT WINDOW. BUT THE THING I WANT TO MAKE SURE

WE RESERVE ON IS IF THE COURT GETS THOSE MOTIONS AND THEY ARE

AS SUBSTANTIVE AS I THINK THEY'RE GOING TO BE, THEN I THINK THE

COURT IS GONNA NEED MORE TIME. AND UNFORTUNATELY--

34 THE COURT: I GUESS I WON'T KNOW UNTIL I SEE THEM. 10:51AM 1 MR. SIEBMAN: YOU WON'T KNOW UNTIL YOU KNOW. I 10:51AM **2** 10:51AM **3** SIMPLY WANT TO URGE THE COURT TO KEEP ITS--KEEP ITS OPTIONS OPEN IN TERMS OF THAT TRIAL DATE, BECAUSE IT'S EXTREMELY 10:51AM **4** IMPORTANT TO THE DEFENDANTS AND OUR ABILITY TO GET A FAIR TRIAL 10:51AM **5** FOR THE COURT TO FULFILL THE ROLE OF GATEKEEPER ON THAT DAMAGE 10:51AM 6 MODEL. 10:51AM **7** THE COURT: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. 10:51AM **8** I'LL RESET THE FINAL PRETRIAL ORDER FOR 10 BUSINESS 10:51AM **9** DAYS AFTER MY MARKMAN RULING AND RULING ON THE PRELIMINARY 10:51AM **10** INFRINGEMENT CONTENTION -- OR PATENT-INFRINGEMENT CONTENTION, AND 10:51AM **11** THEN EXTEND THE RESPONSE DATE FOR THE MOTIONS THAT ARE TO BE 10:51AM **12** RESPONDED TO BY TODAY, EXTEND THAT FOR ONE WEEK. 10:52AM **13** AND, LET'S SEE, AS FAR AS THURSDAY, IS THERE ANY 10:52AM **14** 10:52AM 15 NEED FOR YOU TO COME ON THURSDAY? MR. KENDALL: JOE KENDALL, YOUR HONOR. WE DON'T SEE 10:52AM **16** 10:52AM **17** THAT THERE'S ANY NEED WHATSOEVER, GIVEN WHAT WE'VE TALKED ABOUT HERE TODAY, FOR US TO DO ANYTHING THURSDAY. 10:52AM **18** THE COURT: OKAY. 10:52AM **19** MR. SIEBMAN? 10:52AM **20** MR. SIEBMAN: I TEND TO AGREE WITH THAT. DOES 10:52AM **21** ANYBODY ON MY SIDE DISAGREE WITH THAT? 10:52AM **22** VOICE: NO, THAT'S FINE, THAT'S FINE. 10:52AM **23** THE COURT: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. DO YOU WANT ME TO 10:52AM **24** 10:52AM 25 | RESET THURSDAY'S HEARING TO ANOTHER DATE? OR JUST GO WITH IT

35 THE WAY WE ARE RIGHT NOW? 10:52AM 1 MR. SIEBMAN: I THINK WE CAN GO WITH IT AS IT IS 10:52AM 2 OBVIOUSLY WE WOULD NEED A HEARING AFTER THE FINAL 10:52AM **3** NOW. PRETRIAL ORDER IS FILED. BUT THE APPROPRIATE TIME TO SCHEDULE 10:52AM **4** THAT MIGHT BE AFTER IT'S FILED. 10:52AM **5** THE COURT: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. I'LL MAKE THOSE TWO 10:52AM 6 10:53AM **7** CHANGES IN A SHORT ORDER THAT I'LL SEND OUT TO YOU RIGHT AFTER WE HANG UP. I JUST DON'T WANT TO HANG UP UNTIL I'M SURE THAT 10:53AM **8** WE'VE COVERED EVERYTHING. 10:53AM **9** 10:53AM **10** MR. STEINBERG: THERE IS ONE OTHER ISSUE, YOUR HONOR. THIS IS BOB STEINBERG. I JUST WANT TO THROW THIS OUT. WE 10:53AM **11** DON'T HAVE TO DECIDE THIS NOW. I JUST WANT TO POINT IT OUT. 10:53AM **12** ONCE YOUR MARKMAN RULING COMES DOWN, THE CLAIMS CONSTRUCTION, 10:53AM **13** BOTH PARTIES WILL WANT TO SUPPLEMENT THEIR EXPERT REPORTS 10:53AM **14** PROBABLY TO ADDRESS THOSE CONSTRUCTIONS. AND AT THAT TIME--10:53AM **15** OBVIOUSLY WE DON'T KNOW WHAT THEY'RE GONNA SAY AT THIS POINT. 10:53AM **16** 10:53AM **17** YOU KNOW, THERE MAY BE SOME ADDITIONAL DISCOVERY NECESSARY WITH REGARD TO THOSE REPORTS. I JUST WANT TO POINT THAT OUT AND 10:53AM **18** LEAVE IT AT THAT. IT MAY EVEN REQUIRE SOME ADJUSTMENT ON THE 10:53AM **19** SCHEDULE OTHERWISE. 10:53AM **20** THE COURT: OKAY. I'M JUST MAKING A NOTE OF WHAT 10:53AM **21** 10:53AM **22 YOU JUST SAID**. MR. STEINBERG: YOUR HONOR, NORMALLY WE WOULD HAVE--10:53AM **23**

10:53AM 24 YOU KNOW, BOTH PARTIES WOULD HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS
10:53AM 25 THEIR CONTENTIONS VIS-A-VIS THEIR EXPERTS AND KNOW WHAT THEY

36 1 ARE FOR BOTH PARTIES. 10:54AM MR. SIEBMAN: THE PATENT RULES THEMSELVES PROVIDE A 2 10:54AM 10:54AM **3** NUMBER OF DAYS FOR EACH PARTY TO SUPPLEMENT ON THE PATENT SIDE WITH RESPECT TO THINGS THAT NEED TO BE SUPPLEMENTED IN THE 10:54AM **4** CONTEXT OF THE CONSTRUCTION. AND I DON'T HAVE THE RULES IN 10:54AM **5** FRONT OF ME, I DON'T REMEMBER IF IT'S 30 DAYS OR WHAT THE 10:54AM 6 NUMBER OF DAYS ARE, BUT THE PATENT RULES THEMSELVES CONTEMPLATE 10:54AM **7** CERTAIN SUPPLEMENTATION AFTER THE MARKMAN IS HANDED DOWN. 10:54AM **8** THE COURT: OKAY. 10:54AM **9** MR. KENDALL: YOUR HONOR, JOE KENDALL. ONE LAST 10:54AM **10** THING. 10:54AM **11** THE COURT: YES. 10:54AM **12** MR. KENDALL: WOULD YOU CONSIDER MY SUGGESTION 10:54AM **13** 10:54AM 14 EARLIER THAT YOU ORDER US IN EARLY JANUARY TO GO BACK TO JUDGE FAULKNER? 10:54AM **15** THE COURT: SURE. YEAH. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT 10:54AM **16** 10:54AM 17 | THAT, MR. SIEBMAN? MR. SIEBMAN: I DON'T THINK WE EVER HAVE AN 10:54AM **18** OBJECTION TO THAT, DO WE? IS THERE ANYBODY ON OUR SIDE THAT--10:54AM **19** WE'VE BEEN TWICE. AND SO I WONDER: UNTIL WE HAVE A MARKMAN 10:54AM **20** RULING, DOES IT REALLY MAKE ANY SENSE TO GO BACK FOR A THIRD 10:55AM **21** 10:55AM **22** TIME? THE COURT: OKAY. 10:55AM **23** 10:55AM **24** MR. KENDALL: I DON'T DISAGREE WITH THAT, YOUR HONOR. 10:55AM 25 THE ONLY THING I'M THINKING IS SOMETIME IN EARLY JANUARY, AND

37 AS BUSY AS JUDGE FAULKNER IS, IF WE'RE GONNA DO IT, WE NEED TO 10:55AM 1 GET ON HIS SCHEDULE NOW. AND I'M THINKING SOMETIME MAYBE THE 10:55AM 2 WEEK OF THE 5TH. IT WOULD BE WORTH OUR TIME AND, IF SUCCESSFUL, 10:55AM 3 CERTAINLY WORTH THE COURT'S TIME FOR US TO ENGAGE IN THAT 10:55AM EXERCISE. 10:55AM **5** THE COURT: OKAY. SO DO YOU WANT ME TO PUT THAT IN 10:55AM 6 MY ORDER THAT I'M GOING TO SEND OUT TO YOU TODAY. TO CONTACT 10:55AM 7 JUDGE FAULKNER AND RESUME MEDIATION SAY NO LATER THAN JANUARY 10:55AM 8 9TH? 10:55AM 10:55AM **10** MR. KENDALL: YES, YOUR HONOR, PLAINTIFFS WOULD. 10:55AM **11** THE COURT: HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THAT, MR. SIEBMAN? AND THAT'S ASSUMING, OF COURSE, YOU HAVE RULINGS FROM ME ON--ON 10:55AM **12** THE MARKMAN ISSUES. 10:56AM **13** MR. KENDALL: YES, SIR. 10:56AM **14** MR. SIEBMAN: RIGHT. DOES ANYONE ELSE WANT TO SPEAK 10:56AM **15** 10:56AM **16 TO THAT?** MR. COLLINS: THIS IS MIKE COLLINS. I THINK THAT'S 10:56AM **17** FINE. WE'LL CERTAINLY TRY TO WORK WITH THAT, ABSOLUTELY. IF 10:56AM **18** THE COURT DOESN'T HAVE TIME FOR THE MARKMAN RULINGS, WE CAN 10:56AM **19** ALWAYS ASK THE COURT TO ADJUST THAT. 10:56AM **20** THE COURT: OKAY. WELL, THANK YOU VERY MUCH. 10:56AM **21** 10:56AM **22** WILL SEND OUT AN ORDER ON WHAT WE'VE TALKED ABOUT HERE, THE THREE THINGS. AND I PROMISE YOU I WILL TRY TO GET YOU RULINGS 10:56AM **23** AS SOON AS POSSIBLE ON THE MARKMAN ISSUE AND THE PATENT-10:56AM **24**

INFRINGEMENT CONTENTIONS AS WELL AS THERE'S A COUPLE OF OTHER

10:56AM **25**

38 MOTIONS HERE THAT ARE RIPE. THERE ARE, I THINK, ABOUT THREE 10:56AM 1 MORE. I'LL HAVE TO GO BACK AND LOOK AT THIS MOTION FOR SUMMARY 2 10:56AM JUDGMENT THAT'S BEEN REPLACED AND SEE--AND YOU ARE GOING TO 10:56AM **3** SEND ME SOMETHING TOMORROW, MR. SIEBMAN, RIGHT? 10:56AM **4** MR. SIEBMAN: YES, YOUR HONOR. WE'LL SEND YOU A 10:57AM **5** 10:57AM 6 LIST OF WHAT WE BELIEVE ARE THE PENDING MOTIONS. 10:57AM **7** THE COURT: OKAY. WITH A COPY TO PLAINTIFF'S 10:57AM **8 COUNSEL?** MR. SIEBMAN: ABSOLUTELY. 10:57AM **9** 10:57AM **10** THE COURT: OKAY. MR. GARNER: YOUR HONOR, ROBERT GARNER. IF I CAN 10:57AM **11** 10:57AM 12 JUST RECAP, I THINK YOU SAID THREE THINGS AND I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE. THE ITEMS IN THE ORDER WILL BE THE PRETRIAL ORDER 10:57AM **13** 10:57AM **14** | **RESETTING--**THE COURT: RIGHT. 10:57AM **15** MR. GARNER: --THE ONE-WEEK EXTENSION ON TODAY'S 10:57AM **16** 10:57AM **17** | **RESPONSES--**THE COURT: YES. 10:57AM **18** MR. GARNER: --THE POSTPONEMENT OF THE THURSDAY 10:57AM **19** HEARING, AND THE MEDIATION. 10:57AM **20** 10:57AM **21** THE COURT: YES. YEAH, I GUESS FOUR THINGS, YEAH. MR. GARNER: THANK YOU VERY MUCH. 10:57AM **22** THE COURT: OKAY. 10:57AM **23** 10:57AM **24** MR. SIEBMAN: WE APPRECIATE YOUR TIME, YOUR HONOR. 10:57AM 25 WE KNOW WITH YOUR DOCKET THAT IT'S EXTREMELY CROWDED FOR YOU

		39
10:57AM	1	AND YOUR LAW CLERKS.
10:57AM	2	THE COURT: WELL, THANK YOU. THANKS FOR SAYING
10:57AM	3	THAT.
10:57AM	4	OKAY. I GUESS THAT'S IT THEN. AND I'LL HANG UP
10:57AM	5	AT THIS TIME. THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR BEING AVAILABLE.
10:57AM	6	MR. KENDALL: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
10:57AM	7	MR. SIEBMAN: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
10:57AM	8	THE COURT: OKAY. BYE-BYE.
10:58AM	9	MR. SIEBMAN: BYE-BYE.
	10	
	11	COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
	12	
	13	I CERTIFY THAT THESE 39 PAGES CONTAIN A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT
	14	FROM THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS.
	15	DECEMBER 11, 2008.
	16	Skelley
	18	JERRY KELLEY, CRR
	19	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
	20	U.S. COURTHOUSE
	21	7940 PRESTON ROAD
	22	PLANO, TEXAS 75024
	23	214-872-4829
	24	
	25	